	Case 3:07-cv-02915-SI	Document 8	Filed 06/21/2007	Page 1 of 3	
			· .		
1	INCELU WINTEDS ESC) (CDN 27750)			
2	LINGEL H. WINTERS, ESO LAW OFFICES OF LINGEI	L H. WINTERS			
3	A PROFESSIONAL CORPO One Maritime Plaza, Suite 40				
4	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 398-294	.1			
5	Facsimile: (415) 393-988				
6	GIRARDI & KEESE	NI 26602)		·	
7	THOMAS V. GIRARDI (SB 1126 Wilshire Blvd.	ŕ			
	Los Angeles, CA 90017-190 Telephone (213) 977-0211	14			
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff and th	e Putative Class			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
11	NORTHERIV DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12					
13	DIDE TET LOD (ELAT		MDL No. M:07-	ev-01827 SI	
14	IN RE TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL)ANTITRUST LITIO	ATION	Case No. C-07-c	v-2796 SI	
15			CLASS ACTIO	N	
16	EMW, Inc. v. LG Philips LCD CO., LTD et al. Case No. C-07-2796 SI		MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME		
17	THIS DOCUMENT RELAT	ES TO	Date: July 10, 20		
18	ALL INDIRECT PURCHAS	SER ACTIONS		Time: 10:00 a.m.	
19			Hon. Susan Illsto Courtroom: 10	n	
20					
21					
22					
23	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3, plaintiff and moving party EMW, Inc. moves the Court for an				
24	order shortening time to hear plaintiff's Motion To Appoint Interim Class Counsel For the				
25	California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup.				
26	On June 4, 2007, plaintiff EMW, Inc. filed its Reply Memorandum Indirect Purchaser				
27	Leadership Proposal of Lingel H. Winters P.C. in the belief that the hearing on various class				
28					
			1		
			I CONTROL OF THE CONT		

MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTING TIME

24

25

26 27

28

motions was firmly set for June 8, 2007 and that there was no further time in which to take action. On June 5, 2007, the Court continued the motions to July 10, 2007. With this continuance in hand, plaintiff undertook to engage co-counsel to join in filing its Motion To Appoint Interim Class Counsel For the California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup. On June 18, Thomas V. Girardi of Girardi & Keese agreed to join as co-counsel and plaintiff set about finalizing said Motion. It is believed that said Motion will simplify the case and increase the manageability and judicial economy for the case, and that therefore, it is in the interest of all parties and the Court for said Motion to be heard on July 10, 2007.

Substantial harm or prejudice will occur if the time for hearing the motion is not shortened in several regards:

- 1) The Court and putative classes will be deprived of the appropriate competition among law firms for service to them.
- 2) The manageability of the indirect purchasers action may be adversely affected by consolidated representation of claimants claiming under the laws of 20-30 different states. The Motion contends that manageability and commonality can only be achieved by subgrouping the various claims.

Some counsel claim that claimants claiming under the differing laws of 20-30 states may be represented by one consolidated group of attorneys. Plaintiff contends that such representation could undermine commonality and predominance and lead to conflicts. Plaintiff contends that there is a natural subgrouping that arises from the complaint in Eliasoph v. LG Philips Co, Ltd. et al., breaks the claimants down into three natural groups:

- 1) Subgroup One: California Claims (*Eliasoph* Second, Third Claims)
 - 2) SubGroup Two: Claims under Other Repealer States with laws involving "Violations of State Antitrust and Unfair Competition

1	Laws" – Eliasoph Fourth Claim)				
2	3) Subgroup Three: Claims under State laws claimed as "Violations of				
3	State Consumer Protection and Unfair Competition Laws – <i>Eliasoph</i>				
4	Fifth Claim.				
5	In such cases as <i>Walsh v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (D.C. Cir. 1986) 807 F.2d 1000, 1017 and <i>In Re</i>				
6 7	School Asbestos Litigation 789 F.2d 996 (3 rd Cir. 1986), the Courts concluded various and				
8	differing state claims may satisfy the predominance and commonality requirement where				
9	subgrouping of such State claims in employed.				
10					
11	The Motion also contends that such subgrouping minimizes conflicts.				
12	Since multiple parties are involved in this complex action, the best notice is by ECF and it				
13	would be impractical to seek stipulation.				
14	WHEFORE plaintiff prays for an Order Shortening Time for plaintiff's Motion to Appoint				
15	Interim Class Counsel For the California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup.				
16					
17	Dated: June 21, 2007 LAW OFFICES OF LINGEL H. WINTERS				
18	A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION				
19 20	Marca OXI Winting				
21	Lingel H. Winters				
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					